

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

12

ARAB AFRICA

The Egyptian Government is also requested to take practical measures in addition to the statements it has issued in protest against the Israeli repression. Such measures should include reconsideration of the level of diplomatic relations and other relations with the aggressive Israelis in various fields. What the government is declaring—namely, that what is happening in occupied Palestine is a threat to the peace process—requires practical content to correspond to the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of the confrontation.

While saluting the Palestinian people's jihad, we convey to their leadership our admiration of the unique heroism in appreciation of the great sacrifices made. We renew the pledge to continue along the road of jihad in order to liberate Palestine from the filth of occupation.

The Palestinian people will not face the Zionist enemies alone; both the Arab and Islamic peoples are all by their side until, God willing, victory is achieved.

Street Demonstrations Banned; Students Arrested
NC051421 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1320 GMT
5 Jan 88

[Text] Cairo, 5 Jan (MENA)—Interior Minister Zaki Badr said today that the freedom of expression on national and Arab issues is a right guaranteed to every citizen. It also exists within all institutions and establishments, he stated. However, the interior minister added, it is totally prohibited for people to use this right to stage processions and demonstrations, because this would give riotous elements a chance to exploit the situation and carry out their plans aimed at jeopardizing security and stability in the country.

In his statement, the interior minister affirmed that, in accordance with the powers vested in them, the security organs will, with all their strength and determination, confront any attempt to stage demonstrations and assemblies on the streets.

The interior minister urged all citizens to safeguard security and order at this critical stage through which the country is passing. There are many local and foreign forces lying in wait to harm Egypt's security and safety, he said.

Meanwhile, some 'Ayn Shams University students, known for their opposition tendency, assembled in the university campus and started obstructing traffic and hurling stones at cars. This prompted the security forces to confront and disperse them. Some of the students were arrested and are being interrogated by the prosecution.

Court Rescinds Travel Ban on Newspaper Editor
NC051429 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1310 GMT
5 Jan 88

[Text] Cairo, 5 Jan (MENA)—At its session today, the State Council Administrative Court ruled that a decision banning 'Abd al-'Azim Manaf, chief editor of the SAWT AL-'ARAB newspaper, from leaving the country be suspended.

In its ruling, the court stated that freedom of movement and travel is an individual liberty guaranteed by the Constitution and the law, and consequently it is not permissible to deprive an individual of his right to move freely and travel without due justification. It is also not permissible to restrict this liberty or impose limits on a citizen's right to use it, the court said.

The court pointed out that according to the State Litigation Department there were reports that the decision to ban Manaf from traveling abroad was based on his possible connection with an organization that members of which were recently arrested. However, no irrefutable evidence had been established regarding this connection, and no such evidence was included in the file sent to the State Administrative Court on the case.

The court concluded that the foregoing cannot be taken as sufficient evidence to place Manaf's name on the list of individuals banned from traveling abroad.

Libya

Al-Qadhdhafi Addresses Basic People's Congress
LD050930 Tripoli Television Service in Arabic
2148 GMT 4 Jan 88

[Address by Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi at a meeting of the local Basic People's Congress in Ben Ghushir on 4 January—recorded]

[Text] Good evening. With your permission, I would like to clarify a few points so we will understand how the Basic People's Congresses work. This one, the Basic People's Congress of Ben Ghushir—do we know how many members it has? How many? Very well. Into how many groups are they divided? Three. That means there are roughly 1,500 people in each group. Well, how many are here? Eight hundred. Well, then, let me ask you a few questions: Those who are university graduates, raise your hands. Good, thanks be to God.

Those who graduated from intermediate schools, teachers and the like? Good. University students? Good. Intermediate students, I mean secondary schools and institutions? Good. Farmers? Good. Production workers? Good. Government officials? Good.

Are there any doctors in the audience? Any chemists? Aren't there any university professors here? Ah good, good. Are there no engineers?

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

13

ARAB AFRICA

As I have told you, I have noticed in the past that some people responsible for implementing the decisions of the People's Congresses do not attend the sessions. Thus, they know nothing about the debates and decisions. Nor do have even the slightest idea about the agenda of the Basic People's Congresses and could not have contributed to the debate on the agenda or the adoption of decisions. However, they are the ones responsible for implementing those decisions. This cannot be allowed to continue and we must stop it. When a certain segment of society is seen not to be deciding its fate and does not take part, its role must be eliminated according to the decisions of the people's congresses and the people's power.

Someone else should take charge of its affairs and be its guardian. We can, for example, call on ordinary illiterates and form a people's committee including a secretary, an assistant secretary, and a secretariat for a group at any level, even for a group of university professors. We can do this if we see that university professors are not attending the congress, even though they know they have one. Why should such people ask for rights? Nor should we wait for them to discharge their duties, as they were not with us when we decided our fate.

We will choose some other group to represent them. The masses will say: Let us choose someone to represent that idle group. Let us choose five people, three peasants and two workers—it doesn't matter if they are illiterate—to represent that group, decide its fate, and take charge of its affairs, such as attending congresses. There is no work tomorrow, where is your ID card, why weren't you there, establishing a committee for trial, forming a people's court, a revolutionary court to deal with those people. [sentence as heard] They cannot say no, as they did not attend of their own free will and did not take part.

Furthermore, it will be all right if they do not participate and remain negative in every respect and in every way, as if to say: I will not join you, not in clothes, food, transport, or travel. We won't protest. However, they will come around the next day and complain about our decisions—we the people. They will moan about our decisions.

They will come around tomorrow and grumble about our decisions. They will ask: Why did you approve such a decision? Why did you allow me only 300 dinars [foreign currency allowance]?

Why did you not join us, take part with us, and learn what is allowed and what is not?

He wants to travel abroad 10 times a year on the assumption that he used to go to Europe, and now they won't let him. Why didn't you attend, as we did, share in the decision, and know that a person is only allowed to go abroad once or twice a year? Some countries have

forbidden their citizens to travel due to the economic crisis affecting the entire world. They have imposed a complete ban, and have not allowed them to transfer any money.

It is far better to stay at home than to beg and fall. We are not living abroad; we do not know the place. We can stay in our own country and not spend any hard currency. That is far better for us than begging and searching for loans, asking here and there for money to eat and drink. Given two alternatives, would you prefer to save face, avoid begging, and still have money, which is better for you, or would you rather go to Greece, Europe, or any other place—even the minor pilgrimage and pilgrimage? Why do you need it? God will judge you if you ask Him: I have money, so should I buy food for myself and my family or should I use it to make the pilgrimage?

If you say: O Lord, I had some money, but I spent it on the pilgrimage. Now my family and I are hungry. God will tell you that He does not accept that pilgrimage from you at all, and that you were not required to perform it. The money should have been used to buy food for yourself and your family or to get some sheep or a farm. It should not have been used for a pilgrimage. Pilgrimage is for those who have the means. I beg your pardon; I singled out certain groups only because I wanted to say that we and the unions should take a serious attitude toward the people from those groups who do not attend. I mentioned that at the General People's Congress. What concerns me is the mobilization of the masses so they may decide their fate. That was the framework for my comments.

We should contact the secretariats of each trade union and vocational conference to determine which members attended the meetings and which did not. That will give us an idea of how many members of the trade union or vocational conference attended and how many did not and why not. It is only natural that those who do not attend should be asked to explain why. You are a member of the Basic People's Conference at such and such a place; why didn't you go?

We discuss the fate of doctors. We say that doctors are managing pharmacies and making a profit from them. We say that—sorry, I did not mean to say pharmacies but offices—private offices. We say that some people go to those offices for medical care. They pay for their treatment and do not go to a publicly owned hospital. A doctor may say: Let me open my own office. A member may say: No, don't let doctors open private offices. Another may say that doctors should work in hospitals in the morning and at their offices in the afternoon. Another member may say: No, don't pay doctors who have private offices. Strike them from the list of doctors working in hospitals. Let them live off the income from their offices.

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

14

ARAB AFRICA

We have to decide these things. The decision will concern this group of people, doctors and patients. We are affected by this decision, we who seek treatment from these doctors. We come to meet within the Basic People's Congress only to find that the doctor is not here. We could tell him, for instance, in our decision: Either you work at the general hospital or you open a private office. You cannot do both. This is our decision. He will reply: No, I cannot live off the income from my office. Therefore, you should let me work at the hospital and at my office. Why are you making things so difficult for me?

Why didn't you attend the meeting and help make the decision? We would expect all doctors, workers, farmers, craftsmen, and professionals to meet before such a session. They should hold special vocational meetings to determine their needs and decide what should be submitted to the people's conferences, supported by their own views, their own views on their own situation and position. Doctors, for instance, could meet and say: We doctors propose to the people's conferences while the latter are preparing their agenda—the agenda you formulated—that we should be allowed to work at general hospitals and, at the same time, open our own private offices.

The second choice is: Let us be free; let those who want to work this way do so and let those who want to live off the income from their offices without working at hospitals and, consequently, without being paid by society do so as well. Those are two options. One may say that at this point, there should be no private offices. That is a third possibility. One may say there should be only socialized medicine, as people need the services of doctors and free medicine. They talk about medical care abroad. The doctors claim that they should decide who will be sent overseas for medical treatment.

Medical treatment abroad is a problem. Who should go and who should not? Who is allowed and who is not? Some people may seek the help of others in influencing doctors to decide that they should go overseas for treatment. If a doctor decides that a patient should not be sent abroad for treatment, then that patient may say: Remove this physician, for he did not send me abroad. The doctor's decision may be right. A patient is sent abroad for treatment because his illness requires it, not because he knows someone who influenced the decision.

You may think that a patient who received care overseas knew some influential person. No. But if you are suffering from some illness, you may say to yourself: That person was sent abroad because he, unlike me, knew someone influential. You don't know any influential people and you start going around to this or that individual, saying: Please help me go abroad for treatment; talk to such and such a person, and so on.

All these manifest forms of corruption in society are unethical. We cannot go on this way. We suppose that doctors meet before the agenda is finalized and decide,

saying that in our view treatment abroad should be conducted in the following way, etc. We have spoken about this before. Treatment abroad should be done this way: If there is a patient at a hospital or someone enters a hospital suffering from a serious illness, the doctors will say: This illness can only be treated with special equipment available, let us say, in Banghazi or Tobruk, or by a specialist working in Sabha.

Therefore, this patient must be sent for treatment at the special center in Banghazi or Tobruk, or should be referred to the specialist in Sabha. The specialist in Sabha will make the decision. That doctor will be the one to decide. He will state that he has seen this patient, and that he should now be examined in France. He will write that there is a center in France that diagnoses such ills. That is enough. In that case, the man could leave, and no one need know. No one has to know his name or that of his family or tribe. He can travel. He is patient No 10, for example. Doctors whose advice we take will tell us how the treatment will be conducted abroad.

After all, even when the state creates a committee to decide such things, the committee will be vulnerable to pressure, especially when it is composed of foreign doctors. Someone may go to a Pakistani doctor and threaten him with expulsion from the country or the loss of his job if he does not recommend treatment abroad. Naturally, he will be scared and recommend that the person be treated abroad. That has happened many times. We have investigated those cases, convicted those involved, and expelled the doctors who gave into such pressure.

Every section of society should work this way—workers at a plant, for instance. A conference should be held at the plant to discuss its problems. Take any plant. Let us consider the case of a factory for smelting scrap metal, regardless of its location. The workers at the plant should meet and discuss why it was closed. It was shut because it was losing such and such an amount of money. Had it remained open, it would have caused us such and such a loss. It requires such and such an amount of money whether it is economical or not.

The decisions made by these workers' conferences will be compiled and the people's committee responsible for this industry will amass the data and present it to the people's congress. After we conclude our meetings as vocational sections, we leave the vocational congresses and enter the Basic People's Congresses as members.

That ends our meetings as peasants or workers. The peasants meet before then to discuss the sale of vegetables, fertilizer, agricultural and irrigation tools, and all the problems they suffer from. For example, they say that we as peasants must bring in agricultural workers from abroad. We need someone to act as an agent, someone to collect the oranges from the orchard and sell them. You can call this person an agent, a middleman, or anything else.

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

15

ARAB AFRICA

The important thing is that he be authorized by law for the benefit of the peasants and their produce. However, sometimes they say that a farm must have a well and a pump, but brothers, if every farm had a well, and a hundred farms had a hundred wells and a hundred pumps, things would become inconceivable, illogical. Thus, farmers will discuss and debate, as our policy calls for a reduction in the number of pumps and wells and to economize on the use of fresh underground water. What should we have? Every four farms should have a well.

Thus, we as peasants, workers, doctors, and manual workers identify and discuss our problems. We should then offer solutions; everything is on the agenda of the people's congresses. Then we attend as peasants and examine an agricultural question. A peasant will claim to be more knowledgeable than anyone else about the problem. We studied the problem at our congress and made the following decision: We can make use of his opinion on the matter, as he is here not only to discuss agricultural matters, but the whole range of problems, as he is a citizen, and not just a doctor or something else.

This is a warning to all sectors of society, particularly those responsible for implementing decisions. This is designed to draw the attention of all groups, especially those responsible for executing the decisions of the people's conferences and those concerned with the decisions that emerge from these halls. They should attend the meetings and take part in the decision-making.

As for the agenda, the assumption was that we had already formulated it, and that you were now debating it. The agenda should not be strange to you. You may wonder who included a given point. The agenda was formulated by the masses. You met before and put it together. That is the theory. When the agenda is placed before you, one would assume that it has no surprises, and contains nothing you haven't seen before. You should say: This is the agenda we formulated. If there is another people's committee somewhere else which submitted a proposal for inclusion on the agenda, that should have been done before, not now. It should have been referred to the conferences and submitted or drafted.

It should be known—we should know that such and such a people's committee has submitted a report on education, health, agriculture, or whatever. But we still hear participants in the conference saying: Who drafted this? Who introduced the question of freedom of education? Each one asks: Who did this? Who did that? You should know all these things—you should know how something finds its way to you.

Suppose I drafted something. When they receive the agenda, the people's conferences should know that this proposal came from so and so. The agenda should have been set by the conferences last year. It should not be strange to them.

The other thing I would like to talk about is the debate. I am referring to the revolutionary program. If you proceed this way, you will need 5 years to debate it. You will never finish. This gathering resembles a parliament or national assembly—I mean that the number of representatives is quite logical. Parliaments do not debate issues with speeches—I mean that we should not use speeches to debate issues at a session such as this. They should be debated from a practical point of view. You, that is, the leading body of the conference, should be responsible for this. The debate should be similar to one in a ministerial council; no one makes a speech. If a planning council meets, its members do not make speeches to debate a point.

If a local security council meets, the debate is not conducted through speeches; it is a debate. You are here to debate, not make speeches. Explanations are good if you want to educate the people, but from a practical point of view, they force us to waste time and prevent us from concentrating on something useful. You debate a subject without speeches or explanations. In my opinion, the revolutionary program is a help here. I do not believe it was submitted in a way that covers every point—there are some 30, or more than 30 points in the revolutionary program. They include education, barter, an end to wages and exploitation, and the fortification and improvement of the coast. Consumer societies and supermarkets are also included.

I do not feel that the revolutionary program was submitted in the way in which you are debating it. It should not be so. First, most of the points were proposed previously; we have finished with them. Those which were rejected were rejected and should not be debated further. Those which were approved were approved; that's it. Whether rejected or approved, these points should not be debated further, even if they are mentioned. The goal is not to debate them again but to put the entire revolutionary program before the people; that is the revolutionary program. Whether you proceed with it or leave it aside is up to you. If you wish to look for another method, do so. But we want to say that this is the revolutionary way.

All we are saying is that this is the revolutionary path we should follow. If you do not like it, follow another one. If you only want to take certain parts of it, feel free. The points related here are only to remind us that this is the revolutionary program. They are not to be discussed with a view to making decisions, as we have already made them. Everything before me in this revolutionary program has been decided. The productive city, for instance—we settled the question of the productive and combative city ages ago. No one will deny that our cities should be productive and combative. The important thing is to discover how to make it a productive and combative city.

There are some people [words indistinct] who are related to this type of life. Every family [words indistinct]. Fine. The congress should come up with practical measures. It is more than a question of speeches.

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

16

ARAB AFRICA

When I look at this revolutionary program, I see that the first point, that of organized common action, (?has been agreed upon by you all). Then, we come to rotation work. What does that mean? It means that each group among us works by rotation in the traffic (?sector), on patrol, in policing the shore, or in taking charge of a power station. I mean rotation as we have explained it. If we decided this before, then fair enough, but how should we set a practical program to implement it? We all raise our hands to express our approval, and the special committee determines the practical program and hands it to us.

You, so and so, will do your rotation tomorrow at such and such a place. You, so and so, will serve at this place. Then comes the possibility of changing if someone claims that his schedule is inconvenient. Put me somewhere else; I will be available on Friday or Saturday, and so on.

And now for organized common action. Suppose all the residents of Bin Ghashir decided to build a school, or to set aside 1 day a week for a property campaign, and 1 day for jamahiri sports. The committees responsible for property, jamahiri sports, construction, or whatever, are the ones who set the executive action program. Then the decision is binding. When the committee comes up with a program, everyone must submit to this framework. Whatever we decide is binding. If we have to build a school, then we build a school.

This committee [word indistinct] decides, for instance, to build a four-classroom school at such and such a place. It needs 4,000 or 10,000 blocks or bricks, which should be brought from such and such a place; it needs earth or cement, which should be brought from such and such a place. It needs 500 people on the morning shift and 500 on the afternoon shift. We divide the 5,000 people we have, for instance, into 500-man groups. When they all (?take part in the work), the school will be ready. This is the collective action we have been talking about.

We take a forest, for example, and make it into plantations. The committee for cultivation determines the executive program. It determines the when and the where, and everyone helps out in accordance with a set schedule. Say 100 people a day clear the forest and transform it into agricultural land. How many plantations will we get? Say 100. Then to whom shall we give them? We distribute them in line with the law calling for them to be given to those with large families, the poor, those willing to work, etc. And in another step we create 100 more plantations and another 100.

Suppose we want to transform the sand dunes into a promenade. In 3 or 5 years they become a promenade. This committee determines its location, the seeds that should be planted there, and the way it should be done.

There should be practical things like this, as this congress and committee is composed of members who each represent a given sector of activity. You, what do you

represent? [Individual replies: "Public service"] Public service, fine, and the fellow next to you? [Individual replies: "Social security"] Social security. As far as that sector is concerned, why should one write a letter saying I am a divorced woman, or a widow whose allowance is insufficient, and then send it to Mu'ammarr? That should not be done. Mu'ammarr will not always be here.

We want to create a situation that will last a year, 2 years, 10 years, 100 years, 1,000 years. We want to decide for our future. Our life is not temporary. It continues generation after generation.

How can we continue looking for Mu'ammarr to give him a letter? This is a case for social security, which is here to listen to all the cases of this kind. In the future, people will need the umbrella of social security. How can we find these people? A way must be found. If you cannot find them by yourself, send people into every neighborhood.

Any family that needs social security should write to the office, which will gather the letters and deliver them to the committee. The latter will then sort them, investigate, and say: True, this family needs social security, and so does that person. Should someone, for example, lose his home due to a fire and need compensation, he should not write or look for Mu'ammarr to tell him that his home burned down and he needs compensation.

There should be a system without you burdening yourself or without you having to seek the favor of others, and without you having to feel embarrassed. This is your right in this country and the country must guarantee your living and life for you. Write down that I am so and so and my house was burned down and its value is so and so, and I no longer have any furniture or money. There should be a law to compensate those who are victims of fires. Who deserves such compensation? The method of determining those who stand to benefit should be fixed—whether at the level of the committee in the locality or the committee responsible for insurance.

You should be compensated in such an incident without you having to go and knock on doors, and without difficulty. There is no need, for example, for a patient who deserves medical treatment abroad to burden himself with having to go and see people, etc. You here should tell us what the procedure should be in cases such as this. If you decide, then this will be implemented throughout the Jamahiriya. It will be a decision.

If a patient has to seek the help of someone influential in this regard then this will be rejected. Shall we let him die? No, we reject that too. Therefore, tell us what we should do. What is the practical way to tackle such a problem—for a patient who deserves treatment abroad to be sent abroad without having to know somebody who is influential? You decide. You doctors—you decide; tell us brothers, what are your views? We said that the hospital is responsible for the patient's treatment. The hospital

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

17

ARAB AFRICA

should say: We have examined this patient and have treated him for, say, 1 year, and there is no benefit in this treatment and the patient must be sent abroad to such and such a country or be transferred to such and such a hospital—you know that there are hospitals in Tripoli and elsewhere.

Let us say that the patient is in Tripoli hospital, then he may be transferred to the Misratah hospital. If the Misratah hospital decides that this patient can no longer be treated locally then it may transfer him to the Shiryah hospital. If the latter says that it cannot treat him and decides that he should be sent abroad then the patient will be sent abroad. It is better that they should transfer you—the patient—within Libya, instead of transferring you from one country to another. There are machinery and apparatuses in various parts of the country. What you find in one part may be different to what you may find in another part. There may be a specialist—let us say in osteopathy—in Tripoli but no one like him in Benghazi, for example.

If they cannot treat you as a patient in Benghazi then that does not mean that you should be sent abroad. No. There is a specialist here. It is preferable for you and your family, and as far as our money is concerned, that you should in this case be treated here. Let us say, for example, that there is an apparatus for brain scanning and let us say that it is in Darnah and that you, the patient, are in Tripoli. If the apparatus is not available in Tripoli you should not be sent, say to Germany, so that they can scan your brain; we have an apparatus in Darnah, which is nearer.

If the apparatus in Darnah is incapable of doing what is required then the patient will be sent abroad to this or that center. He will be sent without any fuss; the patient will be sent even if he does not know influential people. When the money which you have allocated for medical treatment abroad runs out and the patient says that he will pay for his own treatment—he gathers his family and they contribute to his treatment because the allocated money has run out. [sentence as heard] There should be practical debate.

In my opinion, the revolutionary program should be debated in this way. Number one, organized collective work, shift work, the masses and self-management, self-administration, self-sufficiency, the producing family, the producing establishment, the self-sufficient self-managed state, education, freedom of education—how many times have we spoken about freedom of education?

They say we do not know what freedom of education is; a student who does not want to continue his studies in primary or secondary schools or at university but wants to become a carpenter. All right, we decide that he can do so—leave school and become a carpenter. You should not say to him: No, you cannot. Make this available to him. How much money does this require? This is one point.

The other point on the agenda, which is more important—you should debate this—the conferences should debate this memorandum about the budgets. It is better to debate the revolutionary program—30 or 40 points. A lot of points were approved in the past. If there is something new—collective ownership—what is collective ownership? The factory which produces tomato puree—this can be owned by say 10 Libyans. The factory which produces furniture—this can be owned by 1,000 Libyans. We have approved collective ownership.

We have approved collective ownership and now we have to start preparing for it. Any group wishing to own this or that factory should come forward to this or that locality—you should advertise. The group comes and owns this or that company or this or that establishment. Maybe you own the harbor—1,000 Libyans come forward and say that they want to own the harbor. They may say: We own the harbor and will get profits from it and at the same time shall foot any losses, and we will run it, etc. All right.

What is socialism and why the revolution, etc.? There should be no exploitation. That is to say that the money derived from such activities should not go to the pockets of one individual. This does not mean that the state should own these. Why should the state own them? In order to distribute the income among the people. But if there is a group of Libyans who own such a utility, and another owns that utility, etc. then there is no need for a state. Take any factory and make Libyans own it—the important thing is that it should be owned by Libyans. That is it—the aim has been achieved. This is what we want.

Why should it be owned by the state? So that the benefit will go to the entire people. But if it is owned by one person then that person will get the benefit alone. He will become rich with a fat belly. They say God has given him this wealth—no God has not; we served and made efforts while he reaped everything and pocketed the profit. We work for 8 hours—he pays us for 3 hours and pockets 5 hours.

If there are 1,000 Libyans who own a hotel or 100 Libyans owning a hotel or 10 Libyans owning a hotel or a coffee-shop or any activity at all, which is supposed to be productive; or owning a farm or a building company or a cleaning company, or Libyans who establish a plant or a workshop—as long as they are a group of Libyans without a specific individual who is an owner who exploits them—that is to say all the Libyans are equal partners—then this is the aim.

Let everything be transformed into collective ownership. The huge things remain outside this—for example iron and steel, as 5,000 Libyans will not be able to run this. Also in this category is the petrochemical industries—say the refinery at the Abu Kammash for the production of chemicals, let us suppose, or an ammunition factory—

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

18

ARAB AFRICA

let these be owned by the whole of the people. Only these heavy industries will remain outside this collective ownership. But the majority of the points have been discussed before.

Let us go over them one, two, three, four, etc. Those which we approve we approve, and those which we do not, let us say so. There is no majority and minority in this. Either we totally approve or totally reject. This memorandum on the budget makes it clearer as it shows you how much we expect to allocate for agriculture, and how many millions we earmark for it; how many millions for industry; and how much we earmark for imports from abroad; what are the materials which we import. If the debate concentrates on this then this is preferable. Our income from sources other than oil; the revenue which we will get in 1988—from where? It will come from taxes and custom duties—200 million dinars, duties on production—60 million dinars.

Someone will ask: What are these duties? Why 59 million dinars? Let it be 60 million or 70 million. What are the consequences? The consequences are to increase the duties a little more. What do the duties mean? They mean that when entering a leisure center in Tripoli we have to pay 6 instead of 5, and when we travel by bus we have to pay 11 instead of 10, for example. This is an example. You can increase or decrease these duties and dues.

You can also say: No, the cost of traveling by bus is expensive and the cost of going to the leisure center is expensive and the entrance fee to the zoo is expensive. Why expensive? Because there are dues. All right, decrease the dues. This means that the figure—which is 60 million—which you get from these will become less. It may become 50 million or 40 million. What are the consequences of that? The consequences are that the budget which we said would amount to 200 million will become 190 million or 180 million.

This is a practical and beneficial discussion. It is unlike the theoretical discussion which I see in all the conferences now. This is before the income from the oil and the income from things inside Libya. The latter you should discuss; can we reduce them or increase them? Even the oil. We said that we sell 996,000 barrels a day; this brings us 100 million [currency not specified] a month, for example. You can control this by saying that as long as the oil is cheap we will not sell. We may say that you will sell only 900,000 barrels per day and get 90 million instead of 100 million a month. You may increase revenues from other sources and decrease oil exports.

But nobody can say: well 1.5 million barrels of oil a day. This is not allowed; Libya has its quota. This is in order to make available on the markets 15 million barrels of oil per day, for example. If the quantity increases the price will decrease. The oil-producing states have agreed on

the quotas; each state has been allocated a quota. This is Libya's quota. That is to say less than 1 million barrels per day. There are things which are fixed. But we can cut back.

We can also say: No, we shall sell our oil at \$25 per barrel. If nobody comes along to buy our oil we shall not get 100 million every month. What shall we get? We will get 50 million a month. All right, we shall put up with this situation. We shall put up with this situation in return for imposing our condition—to sell at \$25 per barrel. Then the other states will follow in our footsteps.

You have total freedom—you can decide and know the consequences of your decision. Do not tell me that this is expensive and this cheap. Clothes—you go to the market and find that this shirt is expensive, and this footwear is expensive, while that is cheap. Why? You should know why. Where did you buy it from? From Europe. We bought it for 5 dinars. What do you charge for it? We sell it for 8 dinars. Why the 3 dinar increase? It is customs duties. According to customs duties the commodity which costs 5 dinars sells at 8 dinars. Someone may come and say: No, this is expensive. Reduce the cost and impose only 1 dinar as custom duties. If this shirt costs you 5 dinars sell at 6 dinars only. If we do that this means that the customs duties will give us 150 million dinars instead of 210 million dinars.

What will happen as a consequence? The budget which we have estimated at 2 billion dinars will become 1.7 billion. Therefore, you will have to cut according to your cloth, as they say. This is your money and this is what you need. You can reduce this and increase that; you can do what you like. We may rejoice and say that we have reduced the cost of clothes, but this will be at the expense of the budget. It means that the budget has decreased. This is because the duties and dues means that each one of us is contributing a little by paying them. If we buy something we pay a little more than the cost because we are contributing to the general budget in order to run a hospital and build a road; to provide housing for those who have no houses and carry out reforms; to establish industry and pay for doctors and nurses from abroad, etc.

You may say today: No, bring me something cheap. You can have these things cheap but your budget will decrease. That is to say that instead of contributing 2 dinars to your budget you may say that you want to contribute 1 dinar only. The other dinar has been lost to the budget. Why? Instead of bringing 10 nurses from abroad we can bring only 5. Instead of being able to bring 10 doctors we can only bring 5 doctors. Instead of building 10 schools we build 5 schools only. It should be quite clear to you: Nothing comes down from the sky. This budget has been calculated to the last penny, as they say. It is before you.

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

19

ARAB AFRICA

You can increase this and decrease this—you are free to do so. In agriculture—you may say increase the number of farmers and give them this or that fertilizer free and make the sinking of water wells cheaper for them, and make the price of water pumps cheaper. This means that this budget will decrease. This is because previously they used to give you fertilizer for little money and the pump used to be a little expensive and the sinking of wells used to be a little expensive. The aim was to collect some money from the farmers and put it in the budget. This is what is called revenues—local revenues. Provide these things cheaper and the budget will decrease.

We should discuss this practically and seriously concentrate on these items. We should not take too much time and we should arrive at a practical outcome. This year we should review what we approved last year. Last year we decided that this was cheap and this expensive and we have allocated such and such for this or that.

A member of the people's committee—the specialized member—should have the information from the general people's committee—all this information; he should tell the others: This is the answer. You decided last year that the Libyan farmer can employ a worker from abroad. The members may say: Yes, we decided this, but did the workers not come? He will tell you the reason. Or he can tell you the number of workers who did come but were not enough to distribute among all the farmers.

We have also decided that the produce must not be taken from him by someone else, and we, farmers, must not leave our farms. This one sells his land on the coast; someone comes and takes it from him. Have we not decided? Reply: Tell them the farmers' resolutions—they said that no one came to buy our produce and this responsible committee prevented dealers from coming and taking our produce. [sentence as heard] What has happened? Have we not decided? He says I did not know. All right, refer him to the court, try him. What is the reason?

The general people's committee, the specific general people's committee, its secretary, the concerned official, the bank, those in the customs, whoever obstructed this operation. [as heard] Someone had to issue an order and did not. We said that issuing an order was up to the legitimate authority. Why did you not issue the order? Our produce was left and no one came to buy it. A serious matter and discussion has to commence, and the one who has made a mistake will deserve whatever you do to him. No one will blame you. What are we here for? We are here to [words indistinct].

Maltese Prime Minister Pays Visit to Tripoli

Arrives 4 Jan

LD041448 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic
1330 GMT 4 Jan 88

[Text] The Maltese prime minister, Dr Eddie Fenech Adami, and the members of his delegation arrived in Tripoli at noon today on a visit to the Great Jamahiriya. The secretary of the General People's Committee

led those on hand to greet the Maltese prime minister, who was also welcomed by several members of the General People's Committee, officers of the Libyan Arab Armed Forces, heads of diplomatic and political missions in the Great Jamahiriya, and members of the Maltese Embassy staff in the Great Jamahiriya.

The Maltese prime minister's party includes Foreign Minister Dr Vincent Tabone; Industry Minister John Dalli; the governor of the Central Bank; the director of the Energy Authority; and a number of other Maltese Government officials.

Praises 'Strong' Relations

LD041828 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1755 GMT
4 Jan 88

[Text] Tripoli, 4 Jan (JANA)—In a statement to JANA, Dr Eddie Fenech Adami has expressed the pleasure that he and the members of his delegation feel at visiting the Great Jamahiriya. He said that his trip will strengthen and reinforce the existing relations of friendship and cooperation between Malta and the Great Jamahiriya. He stressed that the Libyan Arab and Maltese peoples are linked by strong bonds, adding: We cherish these relations and are fully prepared to continue our work to bolster them.

He explained: We stress the importance of and need for contacts among the peoples of the Mediterranean. We should be close to each other. Malta believes it is important to find ways to consolidate the ties between the states and peoples of the Mediterranean so that peace in the region may be strengthened still further.

Discusses Bilateral Ties

LD042050 Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1953 GMT
4 Jan 88

[Text] Tripoli, 4 Jan (JANA)—Talks between Libyan Arab and Maltese delegations began in Tripoli this evening. The opening session was attended by the brother secretary of the General People's Committee and the Maltese prime minister, Dr Eddie Fenech Adami. Libya was also represented by the brother secretary of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison, the secretary of the General People's Committee for Industry, and the governor of the Libyan Central Bank. Present on Malta's behalf were Foreign Minister Dr Vincent Tabone, Industry Minister Mr John Dalli, the governor of the Maltese Central Bank, and the Maltese ambassador to the Great Jamahiriya.

The meeting included a review of bilateral relations in various fields and a discussion of ways to reinforce and promote them. International questions of common interest were examined as well.

Both sides have voiced their satisfaction with the level of cooperation in bilateral relations and their desire to bolster and develop those ties in the interests of the

FBIS-NES-88-003
6 January 1988

20

ARAB AFRICA

Libyan Arab and Maltese peoples. Their views on the issues raised were in accord. Both countries highlighted their deep interest in maintaining the Mediterranean as a zone of security and peace.

The participants in the session stressed the need to guarantee the legitimate rights of the Arab people in occupied Palestine.

Received by Al-Qadhdhafi

LD052234 Tripoli Television Service in Arabic
 2000 GMT 5 Jan 88

[Text] The brother leader of the revolution has received the Maltese prime minister, Dr Eddie Fenech Adami. The Maltese prime minister was accompanied by Foreign Minister Dr Vincent Tabone, Industry Minister John Dalli, the governor of the Maltese Central Bank, and the director of the Maltese Energy Authority.

Burkinabe Leader Blaise Compaore Pays Visit

Arrives 2 Jan

LD021348 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic
 1330 GMT 2 Jan 88

[Text] Captain Blaise Compaore, chairman of the Popular Front of the Burkina Jamahiriyyah, arrived in Tripoli at noon today. He is leading a delegation on a visit to the Great Jamahiriyyah. Staff Major 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud headed those on hand to greet him at Tripoli International Airport. He was accompanied by several members of the General People's Committee and a number of Libyan Armed Forces officers, heads of political and diplomatic missions to the Great Jamahiriyyah, and the ambassador and staff of the embassy of the Burkina Jamahiriyyah in Libya.

Meets With Al-Qadhdhafi

LD022202 Tripoli Television Service in Arabic
 2000 GMT 2 Jan 88

[Excerpt] The brother leader has received Captain Blaise Compaore, chairman of the Popular Front in the Burkina Jamahiriyyah. [passage omitted]

Received by Jallud

LD031358 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic
 1330 GMT 3 Jan 88

[Text] Staff Major 'Abd al-Salam Ahmad Jallud met this morning with Blaise Compaore, chairman of the Popular Front of the Burkina Jamahiriyyah. The audience was also attended by Bognessan Ye, secretary general of the Burkinabe Defense Committees.

Delegations Hold Talks

LD031008 Tripoli JANA in English 0718 GMT
 3 Jan 88

[Text] Tripoli, 3 Jan (JANA)—A working session between Libyan Arab and Burkinabe sides has been held at the headquarters of the External Liaison Bureau.

The session was attended by secretaries of the People's Committee for External Liaison, the General People's Committee for General Services, the General People's Committee for Planning, and the General People's Committee for Health.

On the Burkinabe side the session was attended by Jean Marc Palm, minister of foreign relations; Serge Theophile Balima, minister of information; Albert Guigma, minister of agriculture and livestock; Alain Zoubga, minister of health and social affairs; and a number of experts and technicians of both countries.

The brother secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison welcomed the Burkina delegation. He reaffirmed the importance of the visit by President Blaise Compaore, chairman of the Popular Front of the Burkina Jamahiriyyah to the Great Jamahiriyyah for developing and bolstering relations between the Great Jamahiriyyah and the Burkina Jamahiriyyah.

He praised the great development in Libyan Arab-Burkina relations, and described them as being excellent in all spheres. He said that these relations became deep-rooted and firm with the staging of the revolution in the Burkina Jamahiriyyah and its joining the great Al-Fatih revolution, and their standing in one trench against imperialism, Zionism and racism.

The secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison said that the Great Jamahiriyyah firmly believes that close relations and cooperation between Africans is the only guarantee for resisting conspiracies to which the African Continent is being subjected. He pointed out that the imperialist and colonialist conspiracies being encountered by the African Continent require that we all work seriously and sincerely to consolidate cooperation and cooperation between us, and liberate the African will by way of revolution.

Jean Marc Palm, minister of foreign relations in the Burkina Jamahiriyyah made a speech in which he stressed the importance of relations between the Great Jamahiriyyah and the Burkina Jamahiriyyah countries linked by the common struggle against imperialism and domination which colonialist circles are trying to impose on the peoples of the continent. He said that the visit of President Blaise Compaore is a tangible expression of our friendly relations and a continuous assertion by the Burkina Jamahiriyyah of its total commitment to resistance against imperialism, Zionism and racism.